



received an inadequate statement regarding the disposition of his hearing and that documents improperly taken from his cell allegedly for the investigation were not returned to him.

By Order dated April 2, 2007, this Court considered the Wolff line of cases and determined there is some evidence to support the hearing officer's decision of Plaintiff's guilt and as such Plaintiff received the due process to which he was entitled. (Document No. 6.)

By the instant motion, filed on April 16, 2007, Plaintiff moves for reconsideration of this Court's April 2, 2007 Order on the basis that this Court did not consider that the handwriting sample that was taken from Plaintiff's cell was not produced at Plaintiff's disciplinary hearing. The Court notes that it specifically discussed the handwriting sample in footnote 4 and at the bottom of page 5 of this Court's Order. (See Document No. 6.)

This Court declines to consider Plaintiff's motion as the basis for this Court's dismissal still stands and Plaintiff has not asserted any new claims or facts that would alter the analysis of that Order. Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Document No. 8) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Signed: April 17, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Graham C. Mullen", written over a horizontal line.

Graham C. Mullen  
United States District Judge

